

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 5. This sheet replaces the original sheet including Fig. 5. In Fig. 5, the line from Step S6 to S3 has been deleted, and a line from Step S6 to S4 has been inserted. Furthermore, in Step S2, “*zx, zy, zw, zh, zres*” has been changed to --*zw, zh, zulx, zuly, zres*--. An annotated sheet showing changes in red is also attached.

Attachments: Replacement Sheet
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 15, 2005, and the Advisory Action dated November 30, 2005. Claims 1-41 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 19 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 3, 16, 19, 20, and 30 are independent.

Applicants note with appreciation the allowance of Claims 3-18, 20-32, and 34-41.

The attached replacement sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 5 in order to correct typographical errors. In Fig. 5, the line from Step S6 to S3 has been deleted, and a line from Step S6 to S4 has been inserted. Furthermore, in Step S2, "zx, zy, zw, zh, zres" has been changed to --zw, zh, zulx, zuly, zres--. See, e.g., page 18, lines 1-2 of the present specification. An annotated sheet showing changes in red is also attached. Entry of these changes is respectfully requested; Applicant submits that no new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 2, 19, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,314,452 to Dekel et al.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of processing a coded digital signal including (1) a set of samples of different types obtained by coding a set of original samples representing physical quantities, and (2) a set of information representing original samples and parameters used during the coding. The method includes the steps of determining a subset of samples corresponding to a selected part of the original digital signal using the set of information, and obtaining a number of samples of at least one predetermined type and which are contained in the determined subset of samples. The

method further includes the step of deciding, at a decoding side, whether or not to modify the determined subset of samples according to the obtained number of samples of the at least one predetermined type, before restoring the selected part of the original signal.

Among other notable features of Claim 1 are deciding, at a decoding side, whether or not to modify the determined subset of samples according to the obtained number of samples of the predetermined type(s), before restoring the selected part of the original signal.

Dekel et al., as understood by Applicant, relates to a system for accessing a portion of an image. When a user wishes to access a remote image, the server performs a fast pre-processing step in near real-time of the image. Once the pre-processing stage is done (see, e.g., step 202 in Figure 2) the server sends to the client a notification that the image is ready to be served. The server also transmits the basic parameters associated with the image, such as dimensions, color space, etc. Upon receiving this notification, the client can select any ROI (Region of Interest) of the image using a standard graphical user interface. The ROI is formulated (see, e.g., step 203) by the client into a request list that is sent to the server. Each request corresponds to a data block. Upon receiving the ROI request list, the server processes the requests. For each request, the server computes the data block and sends it to the client. The processing of the data block consists of, from a local portion of the uncompressed image, compressing and encoding the data block associated with the ROI. Data encoded is then progressively sent to the client (see, e.g., steps 803 - 804 of Figure 8).

The system in Dekel et al. is based on the graphical selection of a part of an image by a client, after which the client computer determines the data-blocks subset

corresponding to the selected part of the image and some requests are sent to the server in order to designate the selected data blocks. Upon reception of these requests, the server processes the data blocks by compressing and encoding that data. After the encoding, the encoded data is sent to the client in order to be decoded on the client side.

Thus, according to the Dekel et al. system, only the selected part of the image is encoded and sent to the client. At the decoding step, no additional processing is performed. However, the Examiner alleges at page 3 of the Advisory Action that the deciding step of Claim 1 is shown by Dekel et al. in Fig. 14, reference numeral 1412 which, the Examiner alleges, performs an operation depending on a set of conditions in column 11, lines 40 to 45 of that patent. Even assuming *arguendo* that Dekel et al. would teach what the Examiner alleges here, the so-called “modification step” of Dekel et al. is implemented *on the server side*, i.e. during the process of encoding data. On the contrary, in the method of Claim 1, the decision to modify a determined subset of samples is performed before restoring the samples, *at the decoding side*, not at the encoding side. (See, e.g., Fig. 2 of the present application, which depicts a device for decoding a coded digital signal.)^{1/} There is no teaching or suggestion in Dekel et al. of a modification of the number of samples at the decoding side.

Nothing in Dekel et al. would teach or suggest deciding, at a decoding side, whether or not to modify a determined subset of samples, determined corresponding to a selected part of an original digital signal using a set of information representing original

^{1/}It is of course to be understood that the references to various portions of the present application are by way of illustration and example only, and that the claims are not limited by the details shown in the portions referred to.

samples and parameters used during the coding, according to an obtained number of samples of at least one predetermined type and which are contained in the determined subset of samples, before restoring the selected part of the original signal, as recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is believed to be patentable over Dekel et al.

Independent Claim 19 includes certain features which are similar in many relevant respects to the features discussed above in connection with Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 19 is believed to be patentable over Dekel et al. for at least the reasons discussed above.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "L.P. Diana", is written over a horizontal line.

Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200